

and take them to the burn units. One line on the wharf was converted to vapor collection, and will remain in use if the lease is renewed. The Shore Terminals facility maintains a computerized monthly criteria pollutant emission inventory obtained through the use of continuous emission monitors and source sampling. Results of the 1992 and 1993 inventory for the terminal are shown in Attachment 5D. These measured criteria pollutant emissions are below permitted levels as specified by the BAAQMD, however, not all emissions from the facility are required to be accounted for by Wickland (Thomas Reid Associates, 1994). Specifically, no pollutants other than POC from the vapor combustion units are subject to the cap. This is because "secondary pollutants" which are a direct result of the use of an abatement device complying with BACT are exempt under District Regulation 2, Rule 2, Section 1212 (Sierra Research, Inc., 1994). Furthermore, emissions of CO and PM<sub>10</sub> need not be calculated because the BAAQMD has previously evaluated the facility's equipment and deemed that these pollutants would be emitted in insignificant amounts (Thomas Reid Associates, 1994).

For vessels transiting to and from the Shore Terminals facility, air emissions are not controlled by the BAAQMD because they are not stationary sources. The California Air Resources Board has studied these emissions in the past, and broken them down by type of vessel: ocean-going commercial vessels, harbor vessels and fishing vessels (Booz, Allen & Hamilton, 1991). One finding of this study was that two estimates for vessel emissions are necessary; one for the actual time in transit, when the engines are being used to move the vessel at low speed from the Golden Gate to its destination, and one for the time the vessel spends at the dock, loading and loading, with the engines on, known as "hotelling". Estimates for these emissions were calculated for an Air Resources Board study based on actual vessel trips made in 1991, and are shown in Attachment 5C. Current emissions will be higher because these figures do not include barge/tug trips, and they do not take into account new regulations which require escort tugs for some tanker transits, and the total number of vessels using San Francisco Bay has increased by approximately 2%. There has been no increase over this same period at the Shore Terminals facility, and none is anticipated over the term of the renewed lease.

If the proposed lease were not renewed, the air emissions from the upland facility could remain the same or decrease, as discussed in the project description. Emissions from the wharf would cease, providing a small regional air quality benefit. It is not clear what would happen to the emissions from vessels that now transit to the Shore Facilities would do, as some of the vessels would go to other facilities. If they went to facilities where the ship's own pumps would be used, emissions would likely increase, as these engines and pumps are not as efficient as the larger ones at Shore. If the lease were renewed and the number of vessels remains at present levels as planned, the emissions level would remain within historic levels over the period of the renewed lease.

**C. Water.** Will the proposal result in:

	Potentially Significant Impact	
--	-----------------------------------	--